

Nowhere has their fundamental article of faith been more straightly set out than in a book that is apt, nowadays, to be left on one side on the assumption that it is "out of date." It may be that in its constitution-sketching, more homage is paid than now seems relevant to the then fashionable doctrine of "Functionahsm." But if their Constitution—retaining the Monarch but abolishing the House of Lords,—with its elaborate dual organisation of citizen and vocational representation, may be left, or revived only for interesting comparison with the five-fold organisation of the Russian State, the book must be read, for other things in it. Above all, for its argument on democracy, as a *positive* instrument for

"obtaining, for all the people that development of personality, and that enlargement of faculty and desire dependent on the assumption of responsibility and the exercise of will."

Democracy, in their view, in so far as it involves the conscious consent of the many, has the "spiritual value" of substituting persuasion for force. It may be that personal self-determination remains the "supreme stimulus to self activity," but, in modern society, complete individualism is impracticable, politically and industrially. The actual problem is one of re-modelling existing institutions "in such a way as to evoke, in all men and women, and not merely in a favoured few, all their latent powers," and so setting free the individual "not of any favoured social class but from one end of the community to the other" for that full life

towards which organisation, whether
economic, social or
political, is only a means. It is against the
waste of life
that their lances are here set. One feels how
deeply the war
really stirred them. It stirred their minds; it
sent them back
to fundamental issues, to an interrogation of
values.

To a large extent, the reader, here, is in
the moral
atmosphere of *My Apprenticeship* of its
controversy between
"the ego that affirms" and the "ego that
denies." The